

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

1863, for v. Nicolay's ballad 'Griselde', the date of its first appearance, 1778, would be better than the later date, 1810, of the *Vermischte Gedichte* (cf. Goedeke² IV, 230 and 231), and the full title of Petrarca's translation is *De obedientia ac fide uxoria mythologia;* on page 42, under Westenholz, read 'Die Griseldissage' instead of Grieseldis-Sage; change Kirkhof to Kirchhof and add comma; under Martin Montanus read *'Schwankbücher'* for 'Schwanbücher'; read Neudrucke Deutscher Litteraturwerke for Deutschen; Hans Sachs—Fastnachtspiele for Fastnachspiele; it is not quite clear why on p. 43 a list of Additions should be separately printed on the ground that they are "merely translations or adaptations". Many titles in the preceding lists are "merely translations" and all are adaptations; p. 44, the date of Pauli, *Schimpf und Ernst,* should read 1563 instead of 1863.

In conclusion the reviewer wishes again to express his appreciation of the very satisfactory manner in which Dr. Jones has completed this huge undertaking. The mass of material is really of too large a scope for one person to master in all its details. It would seem that a collaboration of several specialists, for the several literatures included, would have yielded richer results. In any task of so comprehensive a character, errors and omissions are well-nigh beyond control, and it is no reflection that the present one is not an exception. Disagreement as to inclusions and exclusions is, of course, inevitable, but it is hoped that the review will be found helpful, and may be of service when the time comes for preparing a new edition of the work.

J. B. E. Jonas.

Brown University.

SIGMUND FEIST, ETYMOLOGISCHES WÖRTERBUCH DER GOTISCHEN SPRACHE. Halle a. S. 1909. Pp. XV+380.

This book certainly will be welcomed by every student of Germanic philology. It is the most complete etymological dictionary of Gothic that exists at present and supplants the well known work of Uhlenbeck which up to this time has been of invaluable service. Of course, it goes without saying that the author has made conscientious use of the work of his predecessors, but he has amplified and revised the material that he found ready at hand. To appreciate the character and extent of this revision it is but necessary to turn to such a word as *aflinnan* 'to go away', where not only all the cognates found in

Uhlenbeck are given, but Latin *lino, līvī,* O. Irish *lenim* and Lith. *leju* are added, while a number of other cognates, adduced by Uhlenbeck as doubtful, are suppressed. In fact, the author's soundness of judgment is shown as much in the rejection of what is doubtful as in the addition of what is new. Thus under *arbaiþs* connection with Lith. *dárbas* 'work' (the absence of initial *d* explained by reference to the parallel between Skt. *ašru,* Gk. δάκρυ) is rejected. Meringer's explanation of the word as a compound is mentioned but dismissed, as Uhlenbeck had done before, as improbable, and the etymology of the word remains uncertain. The author explicitly states in the preface that he does not feel obliged to offer an etymology for each and every word and for good reasons. The pre-Germanic, as well as every other Indo-Germanic language, through contact with pre-historic non-Indo-Germanic languages, must have taken into its vocabulary a number of words of non-Indo-Germanic origin and it is therefore not surprising that for many even of the most common Germanic words no cognates can be found in any other Indo-Germanic dialect. Such is the case with Gothic *kalkjō, siponeis, ufta, stilan, swiltan, leik, waihts* and many others. For other words a cognate may be afforded by but one Indo-Germanic dialect; thus for *qipan* 'to speak' the only acceptable cognate is Old Irish *bél* <**betlo-* (written *bét* by mistake, p. 211). Kinship with Latin *veto* is denied. Of course it is not possible to exclude all doubtful etymologies. Such a procedure would be too radical. Nor would it be desirable, for it would defeat one of the chief purposes of the book, to give an adequate survey of our knowledge of Gothic etymology at the present time by presenting the results that may be regarded as firmly established and thus to indicate the problems still awaiting solution and the lines along which future investigation must follow. Of the thoroughness with which this purpose is carried out the material given under *þūsundi* affords a good illustration. All the current etymologies are given, but the author has his doubts about the common explanation of the word as a compound of *þūs* and *hund,* though he has nothing definite to offer. It seems probable (as Hirt has suggested in his 'Etymologie des Neuhochdeutschen') that the word is a participial formation from a root **tu,* found in Latin *tumēre* 'to swell' with a suffix *-n̥t-,* reduced grade of *-ent-.* How the discoveries concerning *Ablaut* that have been made since Uhlenbeck's book appeared have been used is shown under the word *lamb,* which is not cognate with Skt. *lambhatē, rambhatē,* but with Gk. ἔλαφος, being formed from an Indo-Germanic dissyllabic base **elen, *eln̥* with suffix **-bho.* These examples show how admirably the book fulfills the purpose mentioned above.

In the matter of deriving words from roots the author shows commendable caution. As the Indo-Germanic had more than one root for one concept, so also it had sometimes one root for several concepts. Words of originally different form may in the course of linguistic development assume the same form; compare the case of French *louer* "to let" (from *locare*) and "to praise" (from *laudare*). Thus the author assumes two roots *$\hat{u}es$ to explain Gothic *wisan* 'to dwell' and 'to feast' (p. 318).

It would have been desirable if the author under each word would have given the place or places where it occurs in the text, but that would have considerably increased the size of the book. The copious indices of Germanic cognates at the back constitute a most valuable feature of the work. They are all the more important in view of the fact that good etymological dictionaries of the ancient Germanic dialects do not yet exist.

ARTHUR F. J. REMY.

Columbia University, September 25, 1910.

DEUTSCHES WÖRTERBUCH von Dr. Richard Loewe. *Sammlung Göschen,* Nr. 64. Leipzig, G. J. Göschen'sche Verlagshandlung, 1910.

There was a time, broadly speaking, when etymologies meant everything to comparative philology. The fact that certain languages were related had to be confirmed, the nature of the relationship determined, the divergencies from original unity described. Every correspondence, 'sound for sound,' of words in different languages was then a valuable acquisition. The realization that as the style is the man, so the language is the nation, that 'the origin of speech' occurred at no fixed date, but is constantly going on around us, is slow in coming. It is preceded by an era when the code of sound-laws, paradigms, and rules of syntax, plus a few obvious cases of 'false analogy,' seems to need but one complement: a lexicon quoting for each word of a language the 'sound for sound' cognates or the nearest available thing. The historical grammar and this book (ah, why had no one written it?) would constitute a complete guide to the facts of the language.

It is reminiscent of this period when one reads in the publisher's announcement of Loewe's little book: 'Das vorliegende Bändchen will ein kurzgefasztes Nachschlagebuch sein, das über die Herkunft der neuhochdeutschen Wörter, soweit diese eine Erklärung benötigen, die notwendige Auskunft gibt.' To discuss such a book fully may not be breaking butterflies